



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/781,637	02/20/2004	Zhong Wu	50103-546	3436
49745	7590	06/01/2006		
SEAGATE TECHNOLOGY LLC c/o MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			EXAMINER RICKMAN, HOLLY C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/781,637

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

Holly Rickman

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/20/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-11, in the reply filed on 3/21/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a comma following "0.1 to 15 at.%" in line 4 of the claim. The comma should be deleted in order to clarify that the aforementioned percentage range refers to the titanium dioxide recited following the comma. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 requires that the recording medium set forth in claim 2 further comprises one or more specified elements in a specified amount. However, the claim does not indicate what

Art Unit: 1773

portion of the recording medium includes this added element. The underlayer, the magnetic layer, the protective overcoat, all of these layers, any of these layers? Thus, is it not clear what the claimed amount of 10 at% or less is based on – 10 at% based on the content of the underlayer or the magnetic layer or all layers together, etc. Applicant is asked to specify what portion of the structure this additive element is present in.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu et al. (US 6699600) in view of Ryonai et al. (US 6242085).

Shimizu et al. disclose a perpendicular magnetic recording medium having a substrate, multiple underlayers, a granular magnetic layer and a protective layer formed from a material such as carbon. The reference teaches that the magnetic layer is formed from an alloy such as CoCrPtX wherein the amount of Pt is 10-24 at%, Cr is 12-26 at%, X is 0.5-15 at% and Co is the remainder. Thus, the amount of Co is from 22.5-65 at%. The molar ratio of Pt:Co can be calculated to be about $10/22.5$ to $24/65 = 0.35-0.44$. The reference teaches that any of various oxide, carbide, nitride or fluoride materials can be added to the aforementioned alloy to provide grain separation. The groups of suitable materials is small enough that one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 1773

the art would have immediately envisaged an embodiment using TiO_2 as the grain separating material. See col. 6, lines 17-32. The reference fails to teach the amount of TiO_2 to be added to the magnetic layer as required by claim 1.

Ryonai et al. disclose a granular magnetic layer for a recording medium wherein an oxide such as titanium oxide is added in an amount of about 0.5-12.5 at% in order to achieve good electromagnetic conversion characteristics (col. 4, lines 13-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine the optimal amount of titanium dioxide to add to the magnetic layer taught by Shimizu et al. in view of Ryonai's teaching that the amount added is a result effective variable that affects electromagnetic conversion characteristics. It has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 10-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The closest prior art to Shimizu et al. and Ryonai et al. fails to teach or suggest the claimed structure having the specific materials required for the first, second and third underlayers and the intermediate layer.

Art Unit: 1773

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on (571) 272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Holly Rickman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1773

HCR
May 25, 2006